

## **Revitalisation as a challenge of development policy**

*Aleksander Noworól\**

### Introduction

The policy of territorial development today requires a fresh approach. What might have forced us to this statement is the World Bank Report 2009, entitled "World Development Report 2009. Reshaping Economic Geography" [The World Bank, 2009]. The report analyses the problems in three spatial scales: local, corresponding to a scale of metropolitan area of a large urban complex, national, and international (regional in a continental dimension). The report contains a detailed analysis of development processes in contemporary world, which leads to main conclusions listed below. The number of slums residents reached about a billion, but it does not restrict city population. A billion of people today lives in backward areas of the developing countries, not taking advantage of the globalisation effects. A billion people within Earth population suffers poverty and high mortality rate, without any access to world markets, while other people develop and live in constantly improving conditions. The mentioned geographical research indicates that spatial disparities in income and manufacture noticed in different parts of the world are unavoidable, and an attempt to equalise – in a geographical dimension – the development level carries a risk of failure. However, the report's authors emphasise that social-economic development should also spread to those that live away from the places of intense economic activity. Nevertheless, such spatially unbalanced economic development might be effective even for those people, on the condition of "**economic integration**". Thus, supporting spatially unbalanced economic growth and simultaneously equalising life standards is a challenge for governments and local governments. One of the key aspects of social-economic changes is **urbanisation** – cities development, which – according to the report's authors – constitutes a crucial condition of development. It relates mainly to the local dimension, but has consequences in all scales of development. The report

---

\* dr hab. inż. arch. Aleksander Noworól, prof. UJ - Jagiellonian University Institute of Public Affairs

distinguishes three levels of urbanisation: initial, characterised mostly by the rural areas, intermediate and advanced, typical for areas with high density of urban structures.

On the basis of in-depth analyses the report rejects the assumption of the need for spatial balance of economic development, emphasising that territorial units function and develop properly if they promote transformations in three **dimensions** of economic geography:

- higher **density** of growing and developing cities,
- smaller **distances** enabling migration of the labour force and entrepreneurs to the places of higher economic activity density, and easier contact with each other,
- less frequent **divisions** related to lowering the "economic boundaries" by countries, which enables entering into world markets to take advantage of the scale and possibility of specialised products trade.

### **1. Intensification of development as a challenge**

In the context of revitalisation issues, a real challenge for public policy is intensification and spatial density in local development as one of the forms of increasing "density" within the meaning of report quoted. However, intensification and spatial density in local development require a common approval for two important, strategic aims.

One of them is - in terms of a country that in the last 65 years experienced a stage of industrialisation – **reurbanisation** of vast city areas, connected to the control policy over the suburbanisation processes. Secondary urbanisation is directly related to urban revitalisation, which includes interventions in post-industrial areas and social and economic revival of degraded city centres and pauperising, and sometimes deteriorating, post-war housing estates. Concentrating pro-development actions in the previously developed areas, despite higher short-term costs than in investments such as greenfields' development, brings a number of benefits. Such benefits include:

- limiting interference in natural environment by intense use of previously developed areas (a benefit for environment),
- increasing the city's density, which is connected with the use of existing urban networks and lower than in the extensive development costs of managing municipal infrastructure (a benefit for public budget),
- an opportunity for social integration and equalising life standards of people residing in the areas with crisis phenomena occurring (social benefit).

Another challenge for development in urban areas is – in the age of globalisation – the process of changes stemming from **endogenic values** of the area, country, or continental region. Urbanised areas become similar to each other, especially in cultural aspect. Such unification decreases competitiveness of the cities and metropolitan areas, which elements to a larger and larger extent are image and local or national distinctiveness. This distinctiveness should be connected with specialisation of economic activity. Cultural values and characteristics of local communities are potential bases for gaining the upper hand as far as competitiveness is concerned, provided that they will be identified and transformed into specialisation related to innovative economic and social solutions. Therefore, the local authorities' objective should be to create endogenic future visions of the areas with their local resources, values, and own ways of development.

## **2. Spatial environment development as a problematic issue**

Basing on the theory of L. von Bertalanffy regarding open systems, the author of this chapter proposes to perceive the territory (as human's environment) as a system of interrelations comprised of four elements – subsystems:

- **spatial environment** (animated and unanimated matter) and its aspects: geometrical, technical, environmental – natural and esthetic, etc.,
- **human capital** which – as a phenomenon – has the following aspects: health, psychological-social, artistic, religious, etc.<sup>1</sup>,
- **organisation – connections** between people, and between people and spatial environment understood as their milieu, and their aspects: technological, informational, political, social and economic, etc. According to J. Stoner, R. Freeman and D. Gilbert organisation means "two or more people cooperating within a specific structure of relations to accomplish a particular aim or a collection of aims" [Stoner, Freeman, Gilbert, 2001, p. 619],
- **managing territorial system**, as particular element of the subsystem "organisation" [Noworól, 2007, p. 18–26].

A territory is a phenomenon the elements of which listed above remain within permanent interrelation. Another subsystem of a territory relates to a narrowed down set of issues existing in the previous subsystem. Simultaneously, the nature of phenomena that transform from a spatial extent into specific human characteristics typical of an individual,

---

<sup>1</sup> "A human" is understood as an individual member of a community. Cf. distinction of human capital and social capital, Pretty, 2000, p. 12.

in order to obtain characteristics of social-economic, and finally, management phenomena. From the territorial system point of view as an organisation, spatial environment and people are two basic resources that are the subjects of interaction.

**Territorial development** is a direction of territory change that stimulating causative powers such as: enterprise, balancing endo- and exogenic factors and competitiveness leads to negentropy processes, including:

- increase of complexity, diversity and flexibility of the subsystems' elements,
- enhancing the ability of subsystems to autoregulate,
- increase in innovation (creativity, proactivity) in the subsystems,
- adapting dynamic of constant and inconstant changes to our own needs and to the influence of environment,
- intensification of contacts with the environment [Noworól, 2007, p. 42].

Between the territorial subsystems listed above there is a chain of interactions in different forms. Therefore, a territory has a dual nature. On one hand it is always related to a sequence of particular, physic (geographical), static spaces. On the other hand – it includes any space dynamic relations related to physical and flows:

- of moving resources, like people and capital,
- of organisational capabilities, connecting existing and potential resources into a living "organism" of an open system, creating, absorbing, and returning objects (products, merchandise) and information (values, signs, including symbols).

The dynamic aspects of a territory constantly reshape it, changing its internal structure and relations with the environment.

Contemporary condition of the spatial environment is determined by:

1) **changes of the natural environment** in a range threatening ecological and climatic balance on the Earth, which relates to:

- reducing biologically open areas,
- water, soil, and air pollution,
- changes of temperature and physical-chemical composition of atmosphere in climatic aspect;

2) systematic **expanding of developed territories**, which includes:

- utilised areas – biologically inactive, where municipal services operate, enabling to control possible environment pollution (supervised urbanisation and industrialisation),

- utilised areas – biologically inactive, where municipal services do not operate, there is no control of environmental effects of economic activity and housing (unsupervised urbanisation and industrialisation),
- biologically inactive or partly active areas utilised in the past (post-industrial, railway, post-war areas, desolate housing estates), often contaminated, not re-cultivated (unsupervised post-urbanisation and post-industrialisation);

3) **cultural environment globalisation processes**, causing gradual unification of symbolic transfer and products of civilisation becoming alike, irrespective of the place of emerging, which as an instance manifests itself in:

- emerging new, spatially dominant types of infrastructural objects, such as: motorways, airports, harbours, sewage treatment plant,
- standardising forms of contemporary architecture and industrial design.

A particularly important aspect of the described changes in spatial environment is concentration of negative phenomena in the poverty and social inequality areas. It is also accompanied by irregular economic development of the world, which results in division into poor and rich countries and regions.

Taking into account the above observations, the spatial environment development may be described as a direction of changes within all territorial systems, that by balancing endo- and exogenic factors while stimulating enterprise and competitiveness, leads to negentropy processes including:

- 1) restricting interference in natural environment by the use of the previously developed areas, used resources, materials and waste material to the maximum;
- 2) constant maintenance of the cultural environment quality that provides for proper health standards and life safety;
- 3) regulating infrastructural relations (transport, technical infrastructure network, information communication technologies) which will enable the increase in internal complexity of territories, as well as diversity and flexibility of their roles in relation to environment, in the regional partnership conditions;
- 4) enhancing the subsystems' capability of auto-regulation, by:
  - the use of endogenic factors in creating future visions,
  - increase of public participation (citizens, economic sector, non-governmental sector) in spatial planning,

- the use of technology (especially biotechnology) not interfering in the quality of natural environment and making use of recycling processes;
- 5) increase in innovation (of activities, services and products) in areas of:
- creating a regional partnership system for development, by crossing mental cultural, sector and geographical barriers<sup>2</sup>,
  - increase of significance of accessibility and relations between the areas and centres with the use of information communication technology,
  - limitation of the use of energy and resources;
- 6) providing functional-spatial order in the background of natural geographical diversity (regulating the level of continuity of forms: spatial and cultural);
- 7) intensifying of symbolic environment values by exposing their aesthetic, cultural and landscape values.

The spatial environment development understood in such a way cannot be analysed without the listed negentropy changes, that characterise human capital development.

Stimulation of such changes should lead to:

- 1) life quality improvement by:
- creating an environment enabling long, healthy and creative life for people,
  - elimination of poverty,
  - reducing social inequalities,
  - productive employment,
  - social integration;
- 2) widening of the possibilities of human choices, more specifically – human freedom which should be guaranteed by system of legal acts where human rights are included;
- 3) improvement of the ability to adapt in social and economic contacts;
- 4) improvement of education, and by that enhancing creativity and capability of creating innovations;
- 5) enabling contacts with environment by communication, exchange of goods and values and expansion (spatial, social, economic) with a controlled level of adaptation and aggression.

---

<sup>2</sup> It is about barriers in the way of perceiving the problems of spatial, social and economic problems like: city/country, our/their (e.g. powiat), public/private sector, road construction workers/railwaymen, etc.

Such strictly humanistic concept of development is mainly related to human's needs. It sets high requirements for those in power of (politicians) and those administrating (public administration) territorial units connected to the necessity of reconciling ideological challenges. The requirements concern the extent to which human life quality should depend on their activity, the extent to which it should depend on the social-economic political system, and to which it has been determined by resources and potential of a particular territory<sup>3</sup>. Making choices in the aspects mentioned above is a task of the territorial community the possibilities concern.

### **3. Scale of spatial environment degradation**

A large scale of degradation of environment is a commonly known civilisation problem. Therefore it is worth reminding some data reflecting this issue.

According to UN (UNEP – United Nations Environment Programme) and ISRIC (World Soil Information) data, human activity caused degradation of about 15% of the continental areas, where 13% - is light and medium degradation, 2% - serious and very serious degradation. Degradation is also caused by among others: erosion, industrial and agricultural activity and salinisation, and the so called soil compaction ([www.fao.org/wfs/final/WFSmaps/Map12-e.pdf](http://www.fao.org/wfs/final/WFSmaps/Map12-e.pdf)). It mainly hits the areas where functioning and development are dependent on agriculture.

In Poland, according to GUS (Główny Urząd Statystyczny – Central Statistical Office) data, the total of the areas requiring recultivation in 2008 amounted to about 64,000 hectares, where a vast majority of them are areas devastated to the largest extent of disadvantageous anthropogenic transformations (Table 1). The largest total of areas requiring recultivation can be found in Wielkopolskie Voivodeship (over 10,000 hectares). As far as voivodeships are concerned, soil degradation is the biggest problem in Śląskie and Dolnośląskie Voivodeship (respectively 0.38% and 0.37% of the region's area, almost twice as much as on average in Poland).

---

<sup>3</sup> As an instance it relates to resources and development potential that result from attractiveness of the space (for tourism and housing), or from the occurrence of natural resources (e.g. crude oil, coal., metals) for the economy.

**Table 1. Devastated and degraded areas requiring recultivation in 2008**

Territorial unit	Areas requiring recultivation	Total area of unit	Degraded/devastated areas
	[ha]	[ha]	[percentage]
Śląskie	4 654	1 233 351	0.38
Dolnośląskie	7 423	1 994 677	0.37
Opolskie	3 297	941 167	0.35
Wielkopolskie	10 133	2 982 651	0.34
Świętokrzyskie	2 987	1 171 020	0.26
Łódzkie	4 604	1 821 896	0.25
Kujawsko-pomorskie	3 843	1 797 169	0.21
Warmińsko-mazurskie	4 865	2 417 332	0.20
Pomorskie	2 853	1 831 022	0.16
Małopolskie	2 352	1 518 279	0.15
Podlaskie	2 864	2 018 701	0.14
Lubelskie	3 359	2 512 250	0.13
Zachodniopomorskie	2 993	2 289 248	0.13
Mazowieckie	4 110	3 555 814	0.12
Lubuskie	1 498	1 398 788	0.11
Podkarpackie	1 900	1 784 573	0.11
<b>Poland</b>	<b>63 735</b>	<b>31 267 938</b>	<b>0.20</b>

Source: Bank Danych Regionalnych GUS.

Taking into consideration the role of the cities in contemporary social-economic development, it is worth presenting closely the scale of degradation of cities in Poland, since it is not only about areas requiring recultivation, but also a wider social-economic revival. The research conducted within the project "Revitalisation of Polish cities as a way of maintaining material and spiritual heritage and as a factor of balanced development" ("Rewitalizacja miast polskich jako sposób zachowania dziedzictwa materialnego i duchowego oraz czynnik zrównoważonego rozwoju")<sup>4</sup> enables a comprehensive approach within the scale of problems of such widely understood degradation. The findings of research are presented in table below.

**Table 2. Degraded areas in Polish cities requiring revitalisation**

Type of degraded area	Size of degraded areas [ha]	Percentage of degraded areas [in percent]	Total percentage of degraded areas invested in and urbanised in cities* [in percent]
Old central districts	62337.3	51.8	11.0
Bleak apartment houses	14883.4	12.4	2.6
Post-industrial areas	24034.0	20.0	4.2
Post-military areas	4000.0	3.3	0.7
Post-railway areas	15000.0	12.5	2.6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>120254.7</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>21.2</b>

\* 1.82% of area of Poland

Source: [Jarczewski, 2009, p. 291].

<sup>4</sup> Project no. PBZ-MNiSW-4/3/2006.



Therefore, it should be assumed that about 21% of the cities' area is degraded. It should be also reminded, according to W. Jarczewski, that in old central districts and bleak apartment houses presented in table 2 reside about 4,316,000 of people, i.e. 24.9% of the cities' inhabitants.

#### **4. Revitalisation as an element of the cities' reurbanisation**

As it was noted above, spatial intensification of development requires accepting two main aims, differing from simple, commonly used, but with far-reaching consequences for spatial environment solutions, the so called *greenfields development* – "building in the open". Occupying new, biologically active areas by the cities in a simple model of development, often transforming into suburbanisation and unsupervised "sprawling" of the cities. Suburbanisation was once positively valued as a characteristic carrier of rural areas modernisation. Today it is an important problem of the cities' development. It should be borne in mind that 20% of the population lives in the areas of suburbanisation. The urban sprawl is characterised by the following features:

- the so called widened suburbanisation reaches about 50 km from the central city,
- building dispersion is discontinuous, stepwise,
- suburbanisation is an impulsive process [*Rekomendacje dla KPZK...*, 2008],
- suburbanisation increases the costs of public infrastructure development and maintenance.

The listed above aims of the local development, reurbanisation and endogenic "rooting" of development are the factors of urban revitalisation. In a scientific aspect revitalisation is a coordinated process conducted collectively by the local authorities, local community and other participants, being an element of development policy and aiming at: counteracting urbanised space degradation and crisis phenomena, stimulating development and quality changes by protecting national heritage, abiding by the rules of balanced development [Ziobrowski, 2010]. The issues of such revitalisation may be presented through the prism of its aims. Thus, the aims related to improvement of the condition of spatial environment should include:

1. Restricting interference in natural environment by intense use of previously developed urban areas: degraded centres and housing estates, post-industrial, post-railway and post-military areas (reurbanisation of areas). The essence of reurbanisation is thus

giving the degraded areas a new role in functional-spatial structure of the cities, which is a basic condition of the described above vision of policy.

2. Ensuring functional-spatial order of settlement by regulating infrastructural relations, especially in the area of transport. In the conditions of progressing suburbanisation, the pressure on undeveloped areas should be decreased by creating transport corridors connected to other infrastructural networks, which will focus urbanisation in the specific areas. Concentrating urbanisation around infrastructural corridors might be a success on the condition of providing for efficient transport – especially public transport (based on railways).
3. Maintaining quality of cultural environment (in particular that being national heritage) that enables new functions, and guarantees proper standards of cultural environment (in aspects of health and safety). It is also about keeping the social profile of districts – it should be emphasised that crisis phenomena in the social and economic area characterising housing areas are often connected to technical degradation of resources, and one of the crucial aims of the policy is providing for such technical condition of the development that will guarantee proper standards.
4. Creating endogenic future visions of revitalised areas. Rooting development visions in endogenic features of the areas has also a social dimension, if the aim of revitalisation is maintaining the condition of resources, keeping the community in their place of residence, it is worth by (among others) public participation letting the community to expose what is important for them, and what will finally be a renewed "image" of revitalised area.

The aims connected to human capital development include:

1. Social uniformity, i.e. equalising disparities in life quality by: eliminating poverty, limiting social inequality, productive employment and social integration. In the conditions of low social capital in Poland the processes of disparity will result in harsher conflicts, especially in the degraded areas inhabited by the people suffering marginalisation.
2. Improving education, and by that boosting creativity of people, their ability to create innovations, and in consequence enhancing competitiveness. Innovations have a potential that can be reshaped and properly used for development, if the revitalisation policy assumes equalising, the aim of the public authorities should be improving education of people, in particular people suffering marginalisation, including those living in degraded districts and housing estates.

3. Enhancing adaption ability in social and economic contacts by a suitable welfare and education system. The means to successful functioning in contemporary world is obtaining broad competence that enables interaction with changing reality. A crucial role in these processes should be connecting suitable public policies supported by the public authorities with the labour market policy, directed towards mobilisation and activation of people inhabiting degraded districts.

The identified problems of social-economic development persuade to creating policy enabling conditions for proper functioning of entities of public, private and non-governmental sectors operating in the crisis areas. The following aims of the policy can be indicated:

1. Increase in competitiveness of the areas, with the assumption that revitalisation policy leads in two directions:
  - in more specific meaning, this policy should relate to the increase in competitiveness as the motor of development in contemporary world; this aim should be supported by local, pro-development activities taken by the cities' local authorities,
  - in more general meaning, revitalisation policy should be directed towards the increase in competitiveness of the voivodeship on the national and international level.
2. Opening regions and their cities on cooperation and national and international exchange. It concerns economic and institutional relations, in which a significant role plays the aspect of connection network between economic entities operating on a global scale, and institutional infrastructure of contemporary society, including public and social organisations. The aim of the public authorities' activities should be opening new possible channels of communication and exchange of merchandise, goods, and also values and ideas.
3. Stimulating enterprise development. The aim of public policies, strategically directed towards social-economic development, should be supporting enterprise development, understood as the development of small and medium enterprises (SME), being the motor of competitiveness in the local economy and of economic growth. Stimulating enterprise in the crisis areas has therefore basic significance for development, at first in the local scale, and by accumulation also in scale of voivodeship; development of small and medium companies is also a proof of stimulating the mentioned above endogenic processes.

4. Increase in innovation of social-economic solutions using endogenic knowledge and resources. In the context of revitalisation, pro-innovative policy should involve the use of "frozen" assets of the voivodeship, e.g. by proper activation of urbanised, but economically inactive areas. The characteristic aim of the policy can be as well stimulating the social capital development, based on the knowledge and innovations of involved entities. Innovation in solutions also includes any forms of social-economic activation, specifically directed towards stimulating activity of the crisis areas residents (e.g. in form of the so called social economy).

Revitalisation is thus a highly complex process, requiring interdisciplinary knowledge and cooperation of many entities.

### **5. Managing revitalisation processes**

The definition and aims of revitalisation prove that it is an authentic and difficult to comprehend challenge for those managing the territorial development. By relating to the described above theoretic depictions, the author defines **managing development** as an element of territorial management, including handling the subsystem of territorial organisation management in order to develop the territory and its subsystems. This definition also includes revitalisation processes management, however, it would relate to the **areas identified as crisis areas in a particular aspects**. The negentropy processes within the subsystem of revitalisation processes management should include actions that can be divided according to two depictions.

**The first depiction arranges public intervention in relation to the character and understanding of the notion of territory.** In this depiction the following key managing problems may be identified:

- 1) in the subsystem of spatial environment:
  - a) getting acquainted with the specificity of the area and the type of degradation (environmental, post-industrial, housing, etc.),
  - b) delimitation of the area: criteria and analyses taking into account natural and cultural resources, as well as technical and social infrastructure,
  - c) determining the scale of degradation relating to its type in the context of:
    - violating the norms and standards in force (e.g. environment degradation),
    - benchmarking indicators (e.g. extent of departing from the accepted standards of the residents service),

- d) determining the context of the neighbourhood as a significant means of conditioning crisis areas, but also perspectives of revitalisation;
- 2) in the subsystem of human capital:
  - a) identifying demographic resources and the tendency and character of migrations,
  - b) identifying life quality in the crisis area, including:
    - types and extent of social exclusion,
    - chances and needs related to elimination of the disclosed deficiencies,
  - c) identification of revitalisation beneficiaries, dividing them into:
    - marginalised groups members, as the beneficiaries of protection activities,
    - gentrifiers – potential beneficiaries of changes, able to involve in or bring assets for the area revival;
- 3) in the subsystem of organisation capital:
  - a) identification of organisations:
    - responsible for animating revitalisation (the commune, regional authorities, operator of revitalisation),
    - interested in cooperation in revitalisation process – social and economic partners (public, private, and from the so called third sector),
  - b) promotion of the social-economic development instruments, which relates to:
    - stimulating the influx of new investments in the revitalised area or in the direct neighbourhood area,
    - executing public investments increasing attractiveness of the district by facilitating accessibility (transport solutions) and/or by locating public services creating new citywide functions, and thus a new image of the district,
    - stimulating enterprise of the revitalisation programmes beneficiaries, in particular the residents of districts of social exclusion,
    - implementing active and passive tools for counteracting unemployment (financial support, training courses, social animation),
    - implementing active and passive tools for counteracting social exclusion of the unprivileged persons and groups of people (handicap, addictions, etc.),
  - c) supporting increase in social capital by:
    - identification of the local social leaders,
    - help in self-organising of groups of revitalisation potential beneficiaries, with activation of the leaders,

- reinforcing the civil society institutions operating in the crisis area – mainly non-governmental organisations that direct their activity towards the intensification of effects of the public authority interventions listed above,
  - different forms of social animation directed towards the integration of revitalisation area residents and counteracting social stigma (a street/district day, fairs, cultural street events);
- 4) in the subsystem of management – identification of potential aspects of public intervention related to stimulating social and economic life, divided into:
- a) accessible regulation instruments (e.g. local law),
  - b) animation of revival by the local authorities' intervention or animating inter-sectoral cooperation.

**Revitalisation process management can be also depicted in relation to desired changes of the territorial management subsystem itself.** It concerns the listed above activities and processes analysed from the point of view of systems comprehension of the way of political authorities and public administration functioning, together responsible for the revitalisation process<sup>5</sup>. In this context one can indicate:

1. **increase of complexity, diversity and flexibility of the managing subsystem** by creating institutional and organisational networks of cooperation of the authorities, beneficiaries, and partners of revitalisation processes, in relation to:
  - a) including in the process of revitalisation public institutions of different level, which activities in the area of crisis districts may be conducive to their revival: spatial, social and economic,
  - b) including civil society in the process of revitalisation:
    - social organisations of any type: relief and educational, including public benefit organisation,
    - business organisations,
    - non-formalised groups of beneficiaries, local leaders, etc.,
    - non-governmental structures directed towards inter-sectoral and inter-organisational cooperation in the types of "network of cooperation", "agreement for development" etc.,

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. the negentropy processes listed above, characterising territorial development.

- c) disaggregation of structures and systems of revitalisation process management, in particular by appointing revitalisation operator from outside the structure of public administration;
2. enhancing the **ability of autoregulation of the process** by:
- a) decentralisation and full use of benefits from principles of subsidiarity in the public authorities, implementing the managing instruments in a territorial unit (commune or district) by leadership based on the trust to the authorities,
  - b) creating - by creating rules, concepts and by implementing instruments of crisis area revival – mechanisms of community participation in the process of decision-making concerning revitalisation. These new dimensions of dialogue between the authorities, administration and citizens should use three form of social participation:
    - informing, as giving a wide access to information on the authorities' actions and possibilities of choice that await the citizens and gentrifiers,
    - consulting, as a process of two-way flow of information, in which the beneficiaries have the possibility to influence politicians and administration after getting acquainted with suitable suggestions of the authorities,
    - full participation, as a process in which the authorities representatives and the beneficiaries determine directions, solutions and methods of implementing the instruments of district revival,
  - c) the use of the aforementioned cooperation network:
    - agreements: contractual and virtual,
    - partnerships: public-public, public-social and public-private,
    - support systems, including gaining returnable and non-returnable financial resources for development;
3. **increase in innovation** by the use in revitalisation process:
- a) strategic management, including in particular connecting revitalisation with complex development policy consisting in:
    - integration of social-economic planning and spatial development planning,

- implementing management system in revitalisation programmes and projects encompassing full cyclic planning – organising – motivating process in strategic supervision,
  - b) innovative project solutions in the area of urban planning (e.g. solutions in connecting district with environment), architecture (e.g. creating multi-functional functional-spatial concepts suitable for adaptations for different purposes) and construction (e.g. the use of new building materials enhancing quality and appearance of existing object, both historic and modernistic),
  - c) complex sources of financial supply, including financing with the use of:
    - non-returnable resources, e.g. EU structural funds,
    - returnable resources – loans and credits directed towards revival (e.g. JESSICA programme),
  - d) any type of partnerships, where a part of financial resources is a share of the involved in revitalisation public or private entities,
  - e) information technologies in communication with beneficiaries and partners of the process to facilitate participation processes and monitoring implemented solutions,
  - f) new, enterprising solutions, including socially monitored prototypical actions and projects;
4. adapting the dynamic of changes in the process management subsystem to the current needs, which involves:
- a) open and flexible approach to forming own organisational structures of public administration in relation to the revitalisation operator and revitalisation beneficiaries,
  - b) adapting the methods of managing the revitalisation process to changing needs and requirements, as well as understanding the progress in revival by the beneficiaries<sup>6</sup>.

The described above depictions of revitalisation process management require an interdisciplinary approach and multi-level cooperation: of theoreticians, development processes analysts, and the authorities and practitioners implementing aims and concepts of

---

<sup>6</sup> An example here might be the so called progressive programming, in which consecutive stages of the process are revealed and determined when the residents get accustomed to the effects of previously taken actions.



crisis area revival. Such cooperation should be based on openness and constant process of mutual learning. Interdisciplinary knowledge, essential in animating local development processes, is a necessary condition, but insufficient to efficient implementing revitalisation processes. As it was demonstrated above, in the area of management of this processes there is a need to develop proper approaches, principles, and specific instruments of revival.

### ***Bibliography***

1. Guzik R. (red.), (2009), *Rewitalizacja miast w Wielkiej Brytanii*, Instytut Rozwoju Miast, Kraków.
2. Jarczewski W., (2009), *Podsumowanie*, [in:] W. Jarczewski (red.), *Przestrzenne aspekty rewitalizacji*, Instytut Rozwoju Miast, Kraków.
3. Noworól A., (1991), *Rehabilitacja osiedli mieszkaniowych. Studium na przykładzie Francji*, Politechnika Krakowska.
4. Noworól A., (1998), *Instrumenty zarządzania rozwojem miasta*, Instytut Gospodarki Przestrzennej i Komunalnej, Kraków.
5. Noworól A., (2007), *Planowanie rozwoju terytorialnego w skali regionalnej i lokalnej*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków.
6. Noworól A., (2009). *Strategiczne wyzwania polityki rozwoju wobec Raportu Banku Światowego*, [in:] Kukliński A., Pawłowski K., Woźniak J., (red.), *Polska wobec wyzwań cywilizacji XXI wieku*. Kraków: UMWM, p. 211-220.
7. Poczubot J., (red.), (2009), *Specyfika odnowy małych i średnich miast w Polsce*, Stowarzyszenie Forum Rewitalizacji, Kraków.
8. Pretty J., (2000), *O rozwoju gospodarki lokalnej*, Fundacja Wspomagania Wsi, Warszawa.
9. Skalski K., (2009), *Rewitalizacja we Francji. Zarządzanie przekształceniami obszarów kryzysowych w miastach*, Instytut Rozwoju Miast, Kraków.
10. Stoner J., Freeman R., Gilbert D., (2001), *Kierowanie*, Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne, Warszawa.
11. The World Bank, (2009), *World Development Report 2009. Reshaping Economy Geography*, The World Bank, Waszyngton.
12. UNDP. (2008). *Human Development Indices, A statistical update 2008*. Nowy Jork: United Nations Development Programme.
13. Ziobrowski Z., (2010), *Założenia polityki rewitalizacji w Polsce*, Instytut Rozwoju Miast, Kraków

### ***Internet sources***

1. *Rekomendacje dla KPZK związane z problematyką rozwoju obszarów miejskich, w tym obszarów metropolitalnych kraju*, (2008), KPZK subject seminar 2008-2033, 28<sup>th</sup> February 2008, [www.mrr.gov.pl/aktualnosci/rozwój.../Sprawozdanie\\_4.pdf](http://www.mrr.gov.pl/aktualnosci/rozwój.../Sprawozdanie_4.pdf), access: 30<sup>th</sup> September 2010
2. *Wytyczne Ministra Rozwoju Regionalnego w zakresie programowania działań dotyczących mieszkalnictwa*, <http://www.mrr.gov.pl/Dokumenty%20oficjalne/Okres%20programowania%202007-2013/Wytyczne%20MRR/Horyzontalne%20obowiazujace/Documents/wytyczne%20-%20mieszkalnictwo%20-%20aktualizacja.pdf>, access: 13<sup>th</sup> August 2008.

**Synopsis**

The current policy of territorial development requires a fresh approach, taking into account the scale of degradation of habitats and areas, mainly situated in the cities. The need for an increase in intensity of the land development forces to recognise reurbanisation of the cities, including revitalisation of crisis areas, as one of the basic aims of development. In the process of managing revitalisation processes the activities that relate to each of the elements constituting a territory (spatial environment, human and social-economic capital) are particularly desired, with the use of accessible means of public intervention in the area of regulation and animation of development. It also concerns actions and processes, taking into account systems approach to the functioning method of political authorities and public administration, jointly responsible for the revitalisation process. In this context a number of elements should be enumerated, such as: increase of complexity, diversity and flexibility of managing subsystem, enhancing the capability of auto-regulation of the process, increase in innovations in solutions, and adapting the dynamic of changes in managing subsystem to current needs.

The enumerated depictions of managing revitalisation processes need an interdisciplinary approach and multi-level cooperation: of theoreticians, development processes analysts, and the authorities and practitioners implementing aims and concepts of crisis area revival.

**Key words:** revitalisation, territorial development, development management